

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 12 March 2004. Responsive to the objections made in the Official action, the Specification has been amended to correct informalities therein.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include reference signs mentioned in the description. The Drawings have accordingly been corrected to now include the reference signs for locking element 20 and co-moving hole 111. Thus, it is believed that the objections to the Drawings have been obviated.

In the Official Action, the Specification was objected to because of several informalities found therein. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, the Abstract has been corrected, as well as the Specification on Page 1, Line 10, Page 2, Line 4, 5 and 23 to remove the informalities identified by the Examiner. It therefore is believed that by this Amendment, the Applicant has obviated the objections to the Specification.

In the Official Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 1 and 2 have allowable subject matter, however, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner mentioned that in Claim 1, Lines 20, 26, 28, the "inner locking element" should be changed to "outer locking element"; and in Lines 20-21, "the fixing base" lacks antecedent basis and should be changed to "a fixing base".

It is respectfully submitted that:

In Claim 1, Lines 19-20, 27, and 29-30, the element "inner locking element" is correctly recited, in complete accordance with the Drawings and the Specification. Only the inner locking element 1 has a fixing base 13 that is secured to the door and the lock base 21 by the screws 136.

With regard to "the fixing base" in line 19 lacking antecedent basis, it is respectfully submitted that "a fixing base" is first introduced in Claim 1 in Line 14, wherein "...the inner locking element having a fixing base..." is recited. Therefore, the subsequently claimed recitation of "the fixing base" has a proper antecedent basis.

Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 1 and 2 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 18 June 2004

3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586